1517

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER — PROUDHON

Vol. IX. — No. 20. NEW YORK, N. Y., SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1893. Whole No. 254.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."

JOHN HAY.

Problems of Anarchism.

INTRODUCTION.

2.— *Economic Development Prior to Capitalism.*

Let us return to the dawn of history, taking a rapid view of man's economic development. Self-preservation, the need for food, urged him in common with other animals to exertion. But, like those, he exerted himself only when driven by hunger. Work he hated from the beginning. Naturally a lazy animal, he got knowledge by degrees, and, growing as cunning in wisdom as the ants, he discovered the use of slaves. Fighting with the sub-human denizens of the pristine wilds they together inhabited, first for existence, then for supremacy, he was driven to herd with others of his species. Mutual aid in some degree was a condition essential to self-preservation. Because man was individually weaker than and physically inferior to many of his competitors. But from struggling with these he got to battling with his own race. Perhaps it was first among the members of the same herd contesting over the carcass of some common foe they had slain that human struggles began. Anyway it became habitual for hordes of men to fight. Prisoners captured would be slain in the earliest stages. At length some skill in obtaining food was developed. As soon as a man could procure more sustenance in a day than he could consume, it was more prudent to keep the captives and exploit their labor. But this idea could be the result only of very slow growth. Primitive man would take a long time to reason out the point, though he were spurred on to thought both by his desire for food and by his aversion to labor for it. Whether he first made slaves of the children, the females, or the captives belonging to a rival tribe is immaterial here. Man had slaves to do his work as early as he found them profitable to him.

In the communistic republican tribe they were not absent. And in the after stage of chieftainship and aristocracy slavery became a basic institution. The usages of different races of men varied much in this part of their growth in regard to slavery. Among some it was much more general and intensely developed than among others. In many a large part of the work was done by free laborers, who nevertheless, by reason of their labor, were always accounted of an inferior class. In the earlier societies of ancient Greece all manual labor was done by slaves, but when Rome began to assert herself there were artisans who were no longer slaves. At the height of her power and towards her downfall the free proletarians formed a numerous class. It can hardly be said that the free workmen of those times were better off than the slaves. Some of them, however, became shopkeepers and merchants. Speaking generally, we may say that, until long after Christianity was commonly accepted, chattel slavery was the condition of the laboring masses. Workman, wealth-producer, slave were convertible terms. The need of freedom was present all the while. Vast uprisings, rebellions, bloody wars, century after century attest the fact. They were men, they dreamt of liberty, and a deliverer, a saviour, a messiah, was ever pictured in their hopes and aspirations. More than one of this class at various times and places turned up to supply the demand. But the economic bondage of the workers outlived them all.

Among the masses thus enthralled the ethics of the Christian teaching found a fruitful soil already prepared to assimilate the seed. Its morality, its ideas of the equality of men, a bright and happy hereafter, a scant respect for the rich, and community of goods could not fail to be attractive to the legally de-humanized, robbed, and oppressed laboring population of slaves. So it had become their common belief before it was adopted officially in the Roman Empire. Doubtless this system of morals, obtaining general acceptance, had considerable influence in working out the economic change which replaced slavedom by serfdom as the lot of the people. To modern notions ancient slavery cannot always be grasped in its real light. The number of the lowly was so enormous in comparison with the number of the free population. In Attica the former counted twenty to one of the latter. The other Greek States had even a greater disproportion. And in the later times of the Roman Empire we find the slaves replacing the free workers, being cheaper in competition with them; and they are placed upon the land, the vast estates of the rich, gradually losing the slave's condition for the scarcely less onerous state of serfs, attached immovably to the soil. This change did not occur all at once or everywhere in the same way. It often grew out of the conditions of foreign conquest, the conqueror permitting the subdued tillers of the soil to remain upon it by accepting his terms,— enforced labor, military service, share of the produce, and other dues. When this was fully developed, it constituted the feudal system, a machine of wheels within wheels from the highest to the lowest; the place of each fixed by status and everyone having power over those next below him and being strictly bound to those immediately above, from the king who was absolute, in theory at any rate, down to the chattel workers, considered the same kind of property as the soil they labored upon. The operation of this system accomplished one striking change. The free workers were gradually absorbed into it. In this reign of status none could survive who had not their proper place in the social hierarchy. Hence in self-preservation the proletarians were driven to give up their freedom. None remained outside but a few vagrant tramps, who were hanged on sight without ceremony. This wholesome custom, which might still be recommended to the authorities in dealing with that modern nuisance, the unemployed, was in effective operation as late as the end of the sixteenth century both in England and on the continent.

Out of the feudal system grew the towns, the inhabitants of which again worked out their freedom, increasing in numbers largely through the continual addition of escaped serfs from the land. I am not pretending to give a history either of the birth, growth, or decay of feudalism, but merely indicating the lines of economic change. Now, there are some learned writers of the present day who avow that the working classes enjoyed a very considerable measure of liberty, peace, and prosperity during the later stages of that system. In short, they tell us that the serfs were better situated than are the masses today under the system of capitalism. Nobody, however, can doubt, I think, that in other ways than economic the difference in favor of liberty then and now is vast. Nor is a comparison even from a purely economic point of view between former states and the unprecedented developments of modern times likely to prove favorable to the past. One question arises which in any case demands our best attention. Has the economic side of individual freedom kept pace with its growth in other directions, and with the gigantic enlargements of productive power and general economic improvement?

It is admitted on all sides, not only by Socialistic reformers, but by the ablest of independent thinkers, that the evils of the prevailing economic system are widespread and intense, and the lot of the *free* workers by no means commensurate with the revolution which has taken place in the industrial world. Scarcely any one can be found who denies that improvement is desirable, and but few who would say it is not necessary. The growing belief in the theory of evolution is of necessity attended by the hope, nay, the certainty, of a betterment in the condition of the industrial classes, of the diminution of the glaring economic and social evils that exist, and of a higher form of society than has yet appeared on the planet.

Unfortunately agreement ends here. If one wishes to learn the bottom causes that produce these evils and to know the true method which ought to be pursued in order to eliminate them, a thousand answers, confusing and contradictory, are given in reply. On this rock all ships of social reform are shattered. Hopes are sustained and theories built sky-high, but owing to the instability of the foundation are one after another undermined, topple over, and are finally dashed to pieces. An inadequate grasp of causes seems to me to be the central weakness of all past and present schemes of social and economic improvement. A clearer perception of the origin and nature of things is the only way I know of avoiding this error. An application of principles established upon demonstrated facts must replace the common method of studying social phenomena and economic conditions by empirical generalizations and preconceived theories. The latter is the usual method of most Socialists.

In the course of this inquiry I hope to examine the leading ideas of the more prominent among them as well as the teachings of economists generally upon the causes of the evils that press so persistently for solution. But before starting on a task of such magnitude, the temerity of which can be excused only by the hope that, if it be not well performed, if the errors still remain, and the mists which already surround it be not removed, I may at least reduce them,— before proceeding to this work another question must be investigated; the persistence of the idea of political authority must be accounted for and its nature and claims defined; and then with the result we shall be able to correlate the facts before set down, and thus show the nature and position of individual freedom in relation to the subject of our inquiry.

With Cleveland In.

[National Observer.]

With Cleveland in, no more shall we complain!—
An end, an end is come on James G. Blaine;
The Anglophobiac must abate his rage:
The Irish Vote its valorousness assuage:
The very Mugwump hath not lived in vain!
McKinley — now, O, now to free from stain
Columbia's apron! Now, per special train
The Solid South mails back the Golden Age —
With Cleveland in!

And yet — and yet! Perchance it is in vain
(Such things have been; such things may be again!)
That Harrison (the late) withdraws his gage,
And Ford and Egan both go up the stage!
How if, in fact, the Status Quo remain
With Cleveland in?

Liberty.

Issued Weekly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Four Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 120 Liberty Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JANUARY 14, 1893.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel."—PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

LIBERTY'S AGENTS.

NEW YORK.—Justus H. Schwab, 50 First Street.
BOSTON.—A. H. Simpson, 202 Huntington Ave.
PHILADELPHIA.—Henry Heyne, Corner of Tenth and Market Streets.
DETROIT.—Herman Reif, 94 Gratiot Ave.
CHICAGO.—Geo. A. Schilling, 85 Washington Street.
DENVER.—Charles Greenhalgh, 1646 Arapahoe St., Room 27.
COLUMBUS, O.—Mrs. H. M. Lyndall, 401 E. Mound St.
CANTON, O.—Standard News Co.
LONDON, ENGLAND.—A. Tarn, 124 Temple Chambers; C. Attersoll, 44 Ellington Street, Barnsbury.
MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA.—D. A. Andrade, 213 Russell Street.

SUBSCRIPTION LIST.

We, the undersigned, hereby agree, in case Benj. R. Tucker shall decide to publish in book form a compilation of articles written by him for his paper, Liberty, to purchase of him, at the rate of one dollar each, the number of copies herewith set opposite our respective names, and to pay to Benj. R. Tucker one-half the amount due for these copies whenever he shall call for it, and the balance on the appearance of the book.

PREVIOUSLY ACKNOWLEDGED,	576 copies.
Olof P. Victorin, Minneapolis, Minn.,	1 "
J. K. Ingalls, Glenora, N. Y.,	2 "
W. T. Minchen, Carroll, Iowa,	1 "
James H. Robertson, Jr., 28 St. Philip's Road, London, N. E.,	1 "
Eugene Schmit, Hoboken, N. J.,	5 "
J. H. Levy, 12 Abbeville Road South, Clapham Park, S. W., London,	2 "

The Sociological Index.

In devoting its fourth page, as it will hereafter, to a catalogue of the important articles relating to social science appearing during the week in the world's periodical press, and in offering to regularly supply these articles, in the form of clippings, at a low price (considering the work and expense involved), Liberty vastly adds to its value to students of sociology, *of whatever school*. It hopes, therefore, to receive for this new department a generous support.

The subscribers to Liberty cannot better advance its interests than by purchasing clippings regularly and by bringing the Index to the attention of all people whom it can interest. If, after a period of experiment, the result is sufficiently encouraging, the scope of the Index will be enlarged, and especial attention will be given to the contents of the European press. To do this, the paper must be increased in size. If every subscriber to Liberty would regularly buy at least one clipping a week, the number of pages could be increased to eight *without an increase of price*, two pages more could be given to the Index, and two or three extra pages of reading-matter could be added. Moreover, the paper would at once command an attention that in its present form it cannot receive, and it would become a power. What say you, readers? Will you do it? T.

Tolerance and Intolerance.

One man's meat is another's poison. A forcible illustration of this came to me the other day in the arrival of two documents, both from opponents of Anarchism, one awarding me universal gratitude for my writings and the other declaring that my writings ought to be forbidden by the State. I print them both.

The former is a letter from J. H. Levy of London, the famous "D" of Bradlaugh's "National Reformer," the editor of the "Personal Rights Journal," the secretary of the Political Economy Circle of the National Liberal Club, and a man whose mental acumen and thoroughness of scholarship command for his utterances on social questions the careful consideration of England's intellectual aristocracy:

My Dear Mr. Tucker:

Will you be so kind as to put me down for two copies of your new book? I will remit the price directly I find from Liberty that you are prepared to issue the new publication. As you know, I am at issue with you on at least one vital point of political principle, and I fear also on several minor points; but all students of political philosophy must be grateful to you for your thoroughly sincere and fearless exposition of Anarchism, even if—like myself—they think that political theory a mistaken one. With best wishes for the New Year, believe me always faithfully yours,

J. H. LEVY.

LONDON, DECEMBER 28, 1892.

This is the attitude of a brave man who is not afraid of truth or of error; who desires to hear, and to have others hear, the best and worst that can be said for and against every theory, no matter what it may be. It is the attitude of tolerance,—nay, more than that,—of hospitality.

See now the coward's attitude, the attitude of the man who has a deathly fear of truth, who is afraid to know or hear it, and who, when he cannot answer you, is ready to choke you. It is the editor of the New Haven "Palladium" who speaks,—a palladium not of liberty, but of privilege and oppression. Apparently an old advertisement of Liberty has just fallen into his hands, and it moves him to the following outburst in his issue of January 4, under the heading, "A Suggestion to Legislators":

Cannot the wisdom of our law-makers devise some measure for putting an end to the teaching of Anarchical doctrines in this country? We have laws for the suppression of obscene literature that moral pollution may be prevented. Is moral pollution of this character any worse than that which attends the propagation of Anarchy? Yet there is boldly published and advertised a newspaper which not only "insists on the sovereignty of the individual and the just reward of labor," but also "on the abolition of the State, . . . on no more government of man by man, on Anarchy and Equity." This paper is mailed at the price of one dollar a year, and to give it greater circulation three books, translations from foreign authors, are given to every subscriber.

One of these, a volume of 325 pages, is described in the advertisement as "probably the most vivid picture of the misery of poverty, the extravagance of wealth, the sympathy and forbearance of the poor and despised, the cruelty and aggressiveness of the aristocratic and respectable, the blind greed of the middle classes, the hollowness of charity, the cunning and hypocrisy of the priesthood, the tyranny and corruption of authority, the crushing power of privilege, and finally, of the redeeming beauty of the ideal of liberty and equality, that the century has produced." It is a story of Parisian life by a French writer, and is a realistic picture of some phases of the social life of that great city, but it is overdrawn and untruthful, and in no sense portrays conditions as existing in this country. Yet so artfully is the story told that to the ignorant and prejudiced American reader it teaches the worst ideas that prevailed in Paris during the reign of terror.

Another of these books emanated from a Russian who was a Siberian exile for twenty years. This is said to be "the book which has most powerfully influenced the youth of Russia in their growth into Nihilism. Whoever comes under its influence will fall in love with high ideals." "High ideals," from the Anarchist's and Nihilist's standpoint, are the right to destroy life and property, to defy and to abrogate law, to do—every man—what seems good in his eyes. Is not this species of licentious literature as corrupting to undisciplined minds as any that comes under the ban of the law, and is it safe or right to permit such teachings to be disseminated?

Free thought, free speech, liberty to all men. Yes, but no more license to Anarchical publications or Anarchical teachers.

The cry of this contemptible coward will go unheeded. It is not of the slightest importance, although the "Palladium" is one of the oldest journals in New Haven. I record it here partly because it is the first specific demand for the suppression of Liberty in particular that has ever come to my notice, and partly to shame this narrow-minded editor by contrast with his opposite. T.

Corollaries.

—I am taken to task by the associate editor of "Lucifer," Lillie D. White, and by her correspondent, Lizzie M. Holmes, for my needlessly cruel and harsh verdict upon the alleged book on government from the pens of Mr. and Mrs. Kelso. These kind-hearted fellow-victims (I infer that they have passed through the ordeal of reading the book) do not directly challenge the truth of my affirmations or the correctness of my conclusions. Mrs. Holmes, in fact, seems to concede that my case is perfectly good, and only deprecates the manner in which I chose to deliver my arraignment. Mrs. White is not quite so careful and prudent; she not only ventures to intimate that I am unjust and that I err on the side of intolerance and dogmatic partisanship, but reprints as a set-off some passages of solid imbecility from something somebody has written somewhere in extravagant laudation of the book in question. The reader is by implication asked to believe that the fact that my unqualified condemnation is far from being shared by everybody and is contradicted by an estimate amounting to a panegyric somehow proves that I was too extreme and so far wrong. It is hardly necessary to point out that no wary reader can possibly be caught in the trap. Even if I had not given incontestable proof of the truth of my charges and had contented myself with naked and unsupported accusations, the citation of a mysterious unknown against me would have been totally inadequate and inconclusive. In the republic of letters all may be free (the appearance of the Kelso production and the estimate of Mrs. White's stranger certainly dispels all doubt as to the existence of perfect freedom), but all are not equal. The unsupported opinion of one may have a certain value and weight where another's bare assertions are resented as impudent. But I did not content myself with mere and bare assertions; I proved every point I made. Does the mysteri-

ous stranger follow the same method? Far from it. Yet he presumes to recommend and welcome the book to the world in a way which should be tolerated only when coming from those who can speak with authority. Mrs. White's stranger may be good-looking, good-natured, and very worthy; but, to use a Hibernicism, the little knowledge he has of Anarchism he has yet to learn from those critics of Mr. Kelso's book who are so radically opposed to him. If I have been in the slightest degree unjust to the authors of "Government Analyzed," I am ready to retract and humble myself. Will my kind friends specify my sin or sins? But if no injustice can be shown, then I am perfectly willing to plead guilty to the charges of cruelty and harshness. But cruelty is sometimes only kindness in disguise. Is it not more than cruel to confuse and misinform people, to misrepresent and pervert and distort truths? The Kelsos are guilty of these offences; there was no malice aforethought, perhaps, in their case, but there were criminal negligence and recklessness. Such a case calls for plain speaking. Readers have claims as well as authors, and it is to be remembered that the readers are passive and inoffensive, while the author challenges criticism and invites frank judgment. I agree with the critic who says better hit hard than too softly.

— Our amusing friend Gunton has perpetrated another droll joke. During the recent canvass he posed as the self-constituted professor of economics to the Republican class. Even the sudden desertion of his "scientific protection" by his able assistant, Nichols, was not allowed to disturb his equanimity. The professor delivered his lectures to empty benches; nobody paid him the slightest attention. But he knew that his vindication was at hand, and he was imperturbable. Now that the contest is known to have gone against the professor's truant pupils and the latter are in a repentant mood, there is a fine opportunity for a dignified rebuke; and our professor has improved it. In the "Social Economist" he publishes an article on the economic significance of the election, in which he explains the defeat of his pupils and points out the way by which they may regain supremacy. The Republican party, he says, has totally failed to prove that the national prosperity is *due* to protection. They have been empirical in their defence of protection and have not given it any scientific standing. In their ignorance they have been led to indulge in preposterous claims and transparent absurdities. Indeed, the protectionists have no general principles upon which to rest their plea. In everything except free trade their doctrines are the same as those of the free traders. It is this which makes their reasoning weak, and makes it impossible for them to meet the most telling points of the free traders. Hence it is not surprising that the public should lose faith in protection and its advocates. But the protectionists have now received notice that empirical treatment of great questions will no longer pass for statesmanship. They must not expect to be floated back to power on a reaction created by the inevitable blunders and sins of the Democrats. The people may become disgusted with both parties and flock toward the Socialistic party. To secure a new lease of life the Republicans must take a step forward and formulate a scientific programme. They must understand that we have reached a state of intelligence where nothing but economic philosophy can be made the basis of public policy; not the narrow economics of the English school, but the social economics of the American school, which belong to the complex conditions of modern industry; not the economics of low wages and foreign markets, but the economics of high wages and home markets. With modern American economics to guide them Republicans would secure a scientific basis for protection. Do you catch the drift of the cunning professor's remarks. To appreciate the richness of all this it is necessary to know that by the "American school" our professor means — himself, and by American economics his own economics. Gunton has written some books which have failed, I presume, to create a demand (this, I infer, is why he is so bitterly opposed to the law of supply and demand: what sort of a law is it which fails to create a demand after a supply has been assured?); and he has organized a college of American economics which is not as well attended as he earnestly believes it ought to be. The Republicans pretend to favor everything American, and why should they not buy Gunton's works? Regarded as an advertisement of certain of his books and the college, Gunton's article is a great success. To start out with a discussion of the election and wind up with American economics, *alias* Guntoniana, is very shrewd. V. Y.

Speaking of Kelso's book, Merlino says in "Solidarity": "This book recalls to our minds [By the way, how many minds has Merlino?] a smaller one, which we discovered, as it were, in a little country library some time ago, and would gladly see reprinted,— Engländer's 'Abolition of the State,' a little volume containing a brilliant exposition of the theories which have sapped the foundations of the State. The two chapters on Proudhon would be specially instructive for Individualist-Anarchists." Here's richness! So you discovered this book, Mr. Bright Man, did you?— as it were? And you advise us Individualist-Anarchists to read it, do you?— especially the chapters on Proudhon? And you would like to see it reprinted, would you? Well, let me inform *you*, my ignorant friend, that I discovered Dr. Engländer's book when it was first published in English by Trübner in 1873, many years before I started Liberty; that it has ever since been a cherished volume in my library; that the chapters on Proudhon are my especial delight; that your wish has already been gratified, since a large portion of the book, including the chapters on Proudhon, has been reprinted serially in Liberty within two years; and that I own a set of plates of the matter thus reprinted serially, from which I have only been prevented from printing a pamphlet edition by lack of time and means. The truth is that Dr. Engländer's book is in the main a brilliant exposition of the doctrines of Proudhon and Liberty and a scathing condemnation of the doctrines of Merlino and "Solidarity." But Merlino does not know this, for he is so feeble-minded that, like Colonel Kelso and his wife, he is enabled by no statement of a doctrine, however clear, to recognize, identify, or distinguish it. Does the reader think I speak extravagantly? Then let us test my assertion. In saying that the chapters on Proudhon would be specially instructive for Individualist-Anarchists, Merlino virtually says that these chapters contain some fact which we do not know or some doctrine from which we dissent. Now I challenge him to quote from the chapters in question such fact or such doctrine. He cannot do so. I, on the other hand, stand ready, if he desires it, to give him quotation after quotation from Dr. Engländer utterly at variance with the Communistic solution of the social problem. There is no more resemblance between Kelso's book and Engländer's than there is between "Solidarity" and Liberty.

At a recent meeting of the House of Representatives committee on currency and banking, mainly Democrats, of course, a motion of Mr. Cox of Tennessee that a bill be introduced in the House to carry out the State-bank plank in the Democratic platform was defeated by a vote of *eleven to one!* Then, by a considerable majority, the committee voted to introduce a bill reducing the tax on *national* banks and giving them power to issue notes to the full extent of their collateral. In other words, this Democratic committee not only refuses to weaken the existing money monopoly, but proposes to strengthen it. All of which is respectfully submitted to Comrades Yarros and Walker, and to voting Anarchists generally, with the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

The editor of the London "Freethinker" infers from the success of the subscription-list to my forthcoming book that "there are evidently some admirers of individual thought and hard hitting in America."

J. Fenimore Cooper on J. Whidden Graham.

The following passage from "The Two Admirals" —a book which I, at the age of ten, prompted presumably by the Egoistic virus that had already tainted my blood, pronounced the best of Cooper's novels — is recommended to the attention of Mr. J. Whidden Graham, Mr. F. F. Cook, and those "stanch friends" of mine to whom "Liberty can never again be what it once was":

Sir Gervaise Oakes stopped in his walk, and gazed at his friend with manifest interest, as he perceived that Admiral Bluewater was running over his letter for the third time. . . .

"A set of precious rascals they are, Gervaise!" at length the Rear-admiral exclaimed. "If the whole court was culled, I question if enough honesty could be found to leaven one Puritan scoundrel. Tell me if you know this hand, Oakes? I question if you ever saw it before."

The superscription of the letter was held out to Sir Gervaise, who, after a close examination, declared himself unacquainted with the writing.

"I thought as much," resumed Bluewater, carefully tearing the signature from the bottom of the page, and burning it in a candle; "let this portion of the secret die, at least. The fellow who wrote this has put 'confidential' at the head of his miserable scrawl; and a most confident fellow he is for his pains. However, no man has a right to thrust himself, in this rude manner, between me and my eldest friend; and least of all will I consent to keep this piece of treachery from your knowledge. I do more than the rascal merits in concealing his name; nevertheless, I shall not deny myself of the pleasure of sending him such an answer as he deserves. Read that, Oakes, and then say if keelhauling would be too good for the writer. . . . [His] masterly move is intended to secure me, by creating a confidence that they think no generous-minded man would betray. It is a hook, delicately baited to catch a gudgeon."

The Sociological Index.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL INDEX is a classified weekly catalogue of the most important articles relating to sociology, as well as to other subjects in which students of sociology are usually interested, that appear in the periodical press of the world.

The catalogue is compiled in the interest of no sect or party, the choice of articles being governed solely by their importance and interest.

The articles thus catalogued are clipped from the periodicals and filed, and *these clippings are for sale* in accordance with the following schedule of prices:

Ordinary articles	15 cents each.
Articles marked *	30 " "
Articles marked †	45 " "
Articles marked **	75 " "

Any person can obtain as many of these clippings as may be desired by sending an order, accompanied by the cash, to

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

In ordering, be sure to specify the CATALOGUE NUMBER *of the article desired, not its title simply.*

COUPONS FOR ORDERING CLIPPINGS.

To facilitate ordering and to make frequent remittances of cash unnecessary, coupons are for sale to those who desire clippings. Each of these coupons is good for a 15-cent article. Two coupons will procure a 30-cent article, three a 45-cent article, and five a 75-cent article.

COUPON PRICE-LIST.

One Coupon	$0.15
Seven Coupons	1.00
One Hundred Coupons	12.50

Holders of coupons have only to fill in the blanks with name and address, and the number of the article wanted. Coupons thus filled out can be mailed, singly or in quantities, to Benj. R. Tucker, and he will send the desired clippings in exchange for them. Purchasers are strongly advised to use the coupons, thereby saving time, trouble, and money.

TRANSLATIONS FURNISHED.

Whenever an article indexed is in a foreign language, that fact is stated in the catalogue. Any one purchasing such a clipping at the usual rate gets it in the original language. But, if the purchaser desires, *an English typewritten translation* will be furnished at the rate of 30 cents (or two coupons) for each hundred words. For instance, the translation of a 900-word article costs the purchaser $2.70, or 18 coupons.

BELLES-LETTRES.

29. Bourget's "Cosmopolis." In French. By Parisis. Figaro, Dec. 29. 1500 words.

30. Interview with Alphonse Daudet on Flaubert. In French. L'Echo de Paris, Dec. 31. 900 words.

31. Elisée Reclus's "Nouvelle Géographie Universelle." In French. By Gustave Geffroy. Justice, Dec. 28. 900 words.

45. Pre-Raphaelite Art. Some works by Dante Gabriel Rossetti. N. Y. Tribune, Jan. 1. 3000 words.

55. An Ardent Sport. From the French of Guy de Maupassant. S. F. Call, Dec. 28. 1200 words.

61. Swinburne. [The melody of his poetry.] With portrait. By Joaquin Miller. S. F. Call, Dec. 25. 2500 words.

*62. Tennyson. I. By Samuel Gosse. II. By Herbert Paul. New Review, Nov. 8500 words.

BIOGRAPHY.

*6. James Parton. With portrait. By Julius H. Ward. New England Magazine, Jan. 12 pages.

†7. Percy Bysshe Shelley. By Kenyon West. Andover Review, Dec. 18 pages.

†8. Whittier. With portrait. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. Century, Jan. 6 pages.

24. John Burns. With portrait. By "X" and John Trevor. Manchester Labor Prophet, Jan. 3000 words.

39. Pierre Denis. In French. By Séverine. Matin, Dec. 30. 2000 words.

46. Edouard Drumont, the Anti-Semitic Writer. With portrait. Chicago Post, Dec. 27. 1000 words.

*47. Edward Augustus Freeman. By John Fiske. Atlantic Monthly, Jan. 5000 words.

48. Daudet in His Home. With portrait. Chicago Post, Dec. 29. 1300 words.

*49. At Whittier's Funeral. By Caroline H. Dall. New England Magazine, Jan. 2200 words.

50. Espinasse's "Life of Voltaire." N. Y. Tribune, Jan. 1. 1200 words.

ETHICS.

†27. The Ethics of Social Progress. By Franklin H. Giddings. International Journal of Ethics, Jan. 10,500 words.

52. Nervous and Mental Aspects of Vivisection. By S. V. Clevenger. Religio-Philosophical Journal, Dec. 31. 1100 words.

†53. An Ancient Pessimist. [Hegesias, the Cyrenaic.] By J. Clark Murray. Philosophical Review, Jan. 4200 words.

†54. The Concept of Law in Ethics. By F. C. French. Philosophical Review, Jan. 6800 words.

*73. Our Meanest Crime. [Vivisection.] By John H. Clarke. Medical Advance, Dec. 4000 words.

FINANCE.

*10. The Silver Question from the International Point of View. By Henry S. Brooks. Overland Monthly, Jan. 8 pages.

*21. Do We Need a State-Bank Currency? By Edward Atkinson. Engineering Magazine, Jan. 9 pages.

35. Bimetallism. By J. E. Symes. London Church Reformer, Jan. 1100 words.

*66. Influence of Bimetallism on the Commercial Relations of Europe with Latin America. I. In French. By L. Albertini. Monde Economique, Dec. 24. 3000 words.

76. Currency and Banking. Women's night at Mystic Valley Club. Speeches by Henry Cabot Lodge, Joseph H. Walker, and others. Boston Herald, Boston Journal, Dec. 28. 4000 words.

IMMIGRATION.

†16. Shall Immigration be Suspended? By W. E. Chandler. North American Review, Jan. 8 pages.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION.

†17. Solutions of the Labor Problem. I. Industrial Coöperation. By David Dudley Field. II. Labor Organizations in Law. By Owen B. Taft. North American Review, Jan. 8 pages.

*18. The True Cause of Labor Troubles. By Jno. Gordon Gray. Engineering Magazine, Jan. 8 pages.

*26. "The Coming System." By Edgeworth. Freethinkers' Magazine, Jan. 1200 words.

36. Free Trade vs. Trade Unionism. By H. W. Faweus. Newcastle Chronicle, Dec. 27. 300 words.

68. Trades Unions and Technical Teaching. By H. W. Faweus. Newcastle Chronicle, Dec. 29. 459 words.

LAND.

†14. Farm and Home Proprietorship. By George K. Holmes. North American Review, Jan. 3 pages.

57. The Scottish System of Land Registration. By Lawrence McLaren. Chicago Legal News, Dec. 24. 800 words.

77. Reform of Land Tenure. Symposium by Simon N. Patten, J. W. Sullivan, Edward Atkinson, J. B. Clark, Victor Yarros, E. P. Cheyney, and Bolton Hall. N. Y. Voice, Dec. 29. 4000 words.

POLITICS.

†9. Political Organizations in the United States and England. By James Bryce. North American Review, Jan. 14 pages.

†11. Universal Suffrage in France. By Jean Macé. North American Review, Jan. 7 pages.

44. Letter from a Petty Panamist. In French. By Séverine. Eclair, Dec. 28. 2300 words.

78. Civil Service Reform and Nationalism. Editorial in New Nation, Dec. 31. 1200 words.

80. Switzerland's Method of Elections. Geneva letter in Chicago Inter-Ocean, Jan. 1. 2600 words.

RELIGION.

3. The Religion of Science. By Paul Carus. Chicago Open Court, Jan. 5. 1700 words.

4. Renan's Loss of Faith in Science. By John Dewey. Chicago Open Court, Jan. 5. 3000 words.

†12. The Limits of Legitimate Religious Discussion. By the Bishop of Delaware. North American Review, Jan. 9 pages.

†13. A Bible-Lesson for Herbert Spencer. By Gail Hamilton. North American Review, Jan. 10 pages.

*25. Infidel vs. Christian Inventions. By Matilda Joslyn Gage. Freethinkers' Magazine, Jan. 3800 words.

51. Church and School in Canada. Letter from John Hogg, with editorials. Manitoba Free Press, Dec. 29. 3500 words.

†75. Philosophy of Religion. By Otto Pfleiderer. Philosophical Review, Jan. 8500 words.

SEX.

37. The Origin of Modesty. In French. By Colomba (Henry Fouquier). Echo de Paris, Dec. 27. 1900 words.

38. Good Morals. In French. By E. Lepelletier. Echo de Paris, Jan. 1. 2200 words.

43. Woman's Rights. In French. By Léon Millot. Jurtice, Dec. 31. 1100 words.

64. Sexual Dyspepsia vs. Intellectual Dyspepsia. By J. A. DeArmand. Medical Brief, Jan. 750 words.

82. A Sociological Study. [Case of Charlotte Perkins Stetson.] Editorial in Los Angeles Times, Dec. 22. 1100 words.

SOCIALISM.

**20. Rodbertus's Socialism. By E. Benj. Andrews. Journal of Political Economy, Dec. 17 pages.

32. The Communist-Anarchist Groups of Paris. In French. Justice, Dec. 30. 1250 words.

33. The Reconstitution of the International. Interviews. In French. Eclair, Dec. 27. 600 words.

40. Reactionary Fear of Socialism. In French. By Auguste Vacquerie. Rappel, Jan. 1. 600 words.

65. Interview with Louise Michel. In French. Eclair, Dec. 31. 1200 words.

*67. The Match Monopoly in France. In French. By Alexis Audouard. Monde Economique, Dec. 24. 2500 words.

74. Adoption of Socialistic Ideas by European Cities. By Arthur Warren. Boston Herald, Jan. 1. 5800 words.

81. A Western Minister on Socialism. By Myron Reed. New Nation, Dec. 31. 1500 words.

84. Why the United States Should Acquire and Operate the Telegraph and Telephone Systems as Parts of the Post Office. By John Ransom Bridge. New Nation, Dec. 31. 1600 words.

TAXATION.

2. Agricultural Distress and Local Taxation. By W. E. Riley. Newcastle Chronicle, Dec. 22. 1100 words.

5. How Shall an Income Tax be Levied. Editorial in Lawrence Jeffersonian, Jan. 7. 1000 words.

**15. Recent Commercial Policy of France. By Émile Levasseur. Journal of Political Economy, Dec. 30 pages.

†22. The Ethical Basis of Taxation. By W. W. McLane. Andover Review, Dec. 14 pages.

42. The Tax on Stock-Exchange Transactions. In French. By Camille Pelletan. Justice, Dec. 31. 750 words.

79. The Vexed Question of the Day: Taxation. By Hoyt Post. American Banker, Dec. 24. 2200 words.

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. The Canadian Northwest the Settler's Paradise. By J. Y. Lambert. Chicago Vanguard, Jan. 7. 2000 words.

**19. Study of Political Economy in the United States. By J. Laurence Laughlin. Journal of Political Economy, Dec. 18 pages.

**23. Price of Wheat Since 1867. By Thornstein B. Veblen. Journal of Political Economy, Dec. 36 pages.

†28. Political Economy and Practical Life. By William Cunningham. International Journal of Ethics, Jan. 7700 words.

54. Refutation of the Pinkertons' Defence. By T. V. Powderly. Journal of the K. of L., Jan. 5. 2300 words.

41. The Republic of Labor. In French. By Paul Degouy. Justice, Dec. 26. 1000 words.

56. St. Louisans Who Were With Kossuth in 1848. With portraits. St. Louis Republic, Jan. 1. 4600 words.

58. Liquor and Law in the District of Columbia. Washington Star, Dec. 31. 3000 words.

59. Proposed Quarantine Legislation. Bradstreet's, Dec. 31. 2000 words.

60. Peculiar Laws. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 1. 1200 words.

*63. Vaccination Against Cholera. By the First Woman Who Submitted to the Experiment. With portrait. Review of Reviews, Jan. 3700 words.

69. Medical Legislation in Pennsylvania. Medical and Surgical Reporter, Dec. 24. 750 words.

70. The Question of National Quarantine. Editorial in N. Y. Medical Journal, Dec. 24. 750 words.

71. National Quarantine. Editorial in Medical News, Dec. 24. 800 words.

72. Medical Legislation. By J. W. Lockhart. Medical Brief, Jan. 900 words.

83. How People Live. I. The Problem of the Farmer. By J. Whidden Graham. Christian Union, Dec. 31. 1000 words.

New Books.

Bérard des Glajeux.—Souvenirs d'un Président d'Assises. Les Passions Criminelles, leurs Causes et leurs Remèdes. Paris: Plon, Nourrit et Cie. [18mo, paper, 283 p., 3fr. 50c.]

Blissard, W.—The Ethic of Usury and Interest: A Study in Inorganic Socialism. New York: Scribner. [12mo, cloth, 199 p., $1.]

Casasus, J.—La Question de l'Argent au Mexique. Paris: Libr. Chaix. [8vo, paper, 136 p.]